

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Lee Coursey [lcoursey@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:47 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Lee Coursey (lcoursey@gmail.com) writes:

How can you possibly believe that allowing TelCo's to do anything they want to sites that use more bandwidth is a good idea. You are effectively placing the fate of new-media websites in the hands of another company. I'd hate to be a start-up company trying to provide broadband video or audio under this plan! I'd be put out of business by extortion fees from other companies telling me what I have to pay just to have their subscribers see my product.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.52.160.3
Remote IP address: 68.52.160.3

Sandralyn Bailey**RECEIVED**

From: Mace Moneta [mmoneta@optonline.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:43 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mace Moneta (mmoneta@optonline.net) writes:

Please don't allow the tiering of the Internet. Customers already pay for connectivity (DSL, Cable, dialup), and corporations already pay for facility (T3, OC3, OC12, etc.). Charging additional based upon the success of the web site is tantamount to an income tax. If this is something you are intent on doing, please consider requiring customers and corporations have a choice of equivalent capacity carriers in each impacted market, so that the market can correct this imbalance.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 67.81.48.44
Remote IP address: 67.81.48.44

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Mark Ellis [markellis@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:52 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mark Ellis (markellis@gmail.com) writes:

Can you please explain to me why you would be in favor of a tiered internet? Why should my internet service provider charge google for sending me bits and bytes when I'm already paying for them?

Thank You,
Mark Ellis

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 70.112.110.133
Remote IP address: 70.112.110.133

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Mark Herber II [boba8@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 2:08 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mark Herber II (boba8@yahoo.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Martin

I have read about your recent support for the tiered bandwidth proposal put forth by various telecommunication companies.

Your support is a grave mistake that could destroy the very nature of the internet.

To put this into perspective for you, you very likely use a cell phone on a daily basis to conduct your business activities. These activities result in personal profit to yourself. Does it seem at all reasonable for your cell phone company to charge you a percentage of your profit because you used their network to make it?

Of course not, they got their money for providing you service, just because you happened to make money for yourself in the process does NOT entitle them to the money you earned yourself.

As American citizens, we have the right to free enterprise. Supporting propositions such as this effectively reserves free enterprise to those who are already in big business, shutting out startups and small operations from ever becoming major players.

Don't condemn startup and small internet businesses to failure. Don't stifle American innovation. Don't support this incredibly destructive and one-sided bill.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.15.40.4
Remote IP address: 66.15.40.4

Sandralyn Bailey**RECEIVED**

From: Mark Warner [markrw@pacbell.net]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:51 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mark Warner (markrw@pacbell.net) writes:

Support for Tiered Internet: Are you crazy!! This kind of move will do nothing to help the average citizen only large companie. Why are you nt watching out for our best interests?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 71.143.17.204
Remote IP address: 71.143.17.204

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Marrcus Beattie [crashespad@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 7:42 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Marrcus Beattie (crashespad@gmail.com) writes:

Dear Mr. Martin,

I just read your comments on your support of a "tiered" Internet, and i have to say that I'm ashamed that a person like you is even thinking about this. We are one of the largest and most powerful countries in the world. Yet, we are still behind most of the world in Technology. Do you know that South Korea has better broadband, and wireless network then the USA? do you realize that the Telocs have been givin tax breaks and allowances to build faster net works for the past 5-6 years and yet they are just now doing it?

I am ashamed that you feel the need to pick and choose who has to pay and who doesn't. You protect Vonage from "unfair treatment" but then say that the Telco's can charge extra for people using their "bandwidth" It's not the sites on the internet that use the "bandwidth" it's the american consumers. The Taxpayers, The people who afford your paycheck. prehaps you should remeber who you work for exactly. your job it to encourage growth in the country. not to work to stifle it.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 70.124.216.40
Remote IP address: 70.124.216.40

Sandalyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Matt Pfahl [yelpingsalmon@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 9:50 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Matt Pfahl (yelpingsalmon@gmail.com) writes:

So a tiered and fragemented internet sounds good to you, one in which telcos make more and more money at the literal expense of the citizens of the United States of America? How much are they paying you?

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 134.198.14.36
Remote IP address: 134.198.14.36

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Matthew C Houghland [conseeded@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:32 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Matthew C Houghland (conseeded@gmail.com) writes:

I was sincerely disheartened when I read about your support of a tiered Internet system. The costs this could place on the average consumer, since after all most of the services offered by sites such as Google are free to use, would be devastating to those of us who need to use the Internet daily for personal projects and also for people who maintain their own web space. Please reevaluate your position on tiering the Internet before it does harm to the general population.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 152.43.1.4
Remote IP address: 152.43.1.4

Sandra Lyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Maxwell Whitaker [MMWhitak@vt.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:04 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Maxwell Whitaker (MMWhitak@vt.edu) writes:

Please dont allow At&t and such ISPs to form monopolies by letting them rack up the prices on Google.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.174.66.51
Remote IP address: 69.174.66.51

SandraLyn Bailey**RECEIVED**

From: Michael Barker [Threephase rebel@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:40 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Michael Barker (Threephase rebel@gmail.com) writes:

Recently you gave your support for the tiered internet system that many of the big telecom companies support. This is a bad move. By allowing a tiered internet system, the companies will be able to choose whose site is the easy to access. Should some small site be started up that cannot pay up the money to receive the additional bandwidth, they will be pushed down to the bottom of the bandwidth ladder. This is a lot like paying the Mafia for protection from "accidents". The tiered internet will hurt innovation and prevent good ideas from coming forth just because the people who had the idea don't have enough money to pay for it.

Imagine if Google, the most used search engine on the web, had been unable to give fast search results because their web page took a long time to load because the small startup company couldn't pay the telecoms to provide faster service to their site. There would be a no Google; it's as simple as that. Many other sites would fail also. If the telecom companies are given this much control over the internet, sites that don't support them or don't pay up will suffer. Why would this happen? It would happen because some rich people found a way to get richer and no one is preventing them.

Having a tiered internet is just like having a massive fee for anyone who wants to start a business. Rather than allowing anyone to start a business, it will allow only richer people to start one. It will be the same way with the internet. If someone has a good idea and wants to start a web page, a tiered internet may kill their idea because they cannot pay enough money to the telecomm to get the level of service they need. Please support the people rather than the large telecoms, who already hold monopolies in many areas they provide service. The people's faith and respect of the government and its agencies is already dwindling, don't put another nail in its coffin by allowing corporations to squash innovation.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 198.208.251.23
Remote IP address: 198.208.251.23

RECEIVED

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Michael Beaty [sfbiker@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 2:54 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Michael Beaty (sfbiker@hotmail.com) writes:

Mr. Martin:

I respectfully urge you to reconsider your stated position the creation of a tiered Internet. The FCC is already widely viewed as little more than a rubber stamp for K Street lobbyists pushing for giant media conglomerates' interests. I urge you to consider the public interest here and possibly restore some shred of integrity to the FCC. The Internet has provided a more level playing field for small, independent publishers and citizen journalists to have their voices heard. A tiered scheme would inevitably erode the egalitarian aspects of the Internet the public has come to expect. Network neutrality is also part and parcel of the current network. What problem are you hoping to solve with tiered service exactly If the media giants are simply pigs at the taxpayer's troff, it would be much more transparent to simply ask Congress to send a fat subsidy their way rather than engage in a tiered network access farse. A tiered Internet is not progress. Rather, it is a recipe for government sponsored corporate oligarchy. Michael Beaty
Software Developer Oakland, California

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 63.114.26.6
Remote IP address: 63.114.26.6

Sandra Lyn Bailey**RECEIVED**

From: Michael Farnsworth [Michael2Farnsworth@AMPF.comA]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 4:54 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Michael Farnsworth (Michael2Farnsworth@AMPF.comA) writes:

Why are "very" small businesses forced to pay more for phone service? Why is ATT forcing me to keep one line, pay all taxes just to have access to DSL? Thanks to the FCC, they are the only company in my area to offer DSL. Granted, you might have more ATT stock options than Bill Gates has dollars, but this is nuts. Why am I forced to do business with ATT, you got a job, want to make more, short telephone stock but leave me the market place alone.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 68.248.212.92
Remote IP address: 68.248.212.92

Sandralyn Bailey**RECEIVED**

From: Michael Holloway [mhollo2@uic.edu]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 11:06 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Michael Holloway (mhollo2@uic.edu) writes:

Why is the FCC allowing AT&T to milk large internet sites for more money? The resources are already paid for, what AT&T is doing is called extortion. I doubt my single message is going to do much, but hopefully plenty more people will say something.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 128.248.76.59
Remote IP address: 128.248.76.59

RECEIVED

Sandra Lyn Bailey

APR - 3 2006

From: Michael J. Sherman [stealthboy@mac.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:58 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Michael J. Sherman (stealthboy@mac.com) writes:

You are an idiot if you believe a tiered Internet is a good idea. The whole point of the Internet and the World Wide Web is exchange of information from all types of computers, users, universities, governments, and businesses. It was built by people running servers in their basement and universities with hobbyists contributing to the Web. You will fundamentally destroy the workings of the Internet if you allow the telcos to charge at both ends.

Please, stop being a typical Government entity and actually make some GOOD decisions for once. Surprise us. I dare you.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 64.240.183.10
Remote IP address: 64.240.183.10

Sandra Lyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Michael Lowry [jugul4r@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 2:59 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Michael Lowry (jugul4r@yahoo.com) writes:

I recently read that you support a tiered internet. I believe that your attitude is folly and it is difficult for me to understand how this is 'serving the public interest.' A tiered internet will only further the gap between the mega corporations and the common people. Restricting access to information that you are already paying for is a horrible practice and in my opinion will contribute to an even greater decline in the literacy and overall education of the US populace. Thank you for serving the 'public interest'

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 12.175.69.50
Remote IP address: 12.175.69.50

Sandalyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Michael Mulligan [mtm26@cornell.edu]
 Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:58 AM
 To: KJMWEB
 Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
 Office of the Secretary

Michael Mulligan (mtm26@cornell.edu) writes:

I just read an article
 (http://www.networkingpipeline.com/blog/archives/2006/03/fcc_chief_att_c.html) about you voicing your support of AT&T's plans for a tiered internet where the telcos would have the legal right to charge web site operators a fee for "quality of service" guarantees that seem to be a simple euphemism for organized extortion. You cannot argue in favor of both net neutrality AND charging web sites fees for "adequate bandwidth"--it's like being pregnant and not pregnant at the same time, so pick one.

How would a telco decide which companies need to pay these fees? I bet Vonage and other VOIP providers would be charged--suddenly, the price of their service will skyrocket (or quality of their service will plummet since the connection will be so degraded). Either way, that sure bodes well for the telcos--no more cheap competition to worry about! And how about the little guy with a personal web site or a small company? Will they be able to afford a web presence any more, or do they just arbitrarily not merit charging? I guess Google would have to be charged--with a stock price like that, you know they can afford it, right? How about the FCC--how much will you guys have to pay to keep your web site snappy? What about free web email or other such free services (i.e. most of the internet)--Joe consumer surely won't mind having to pay subscriptions to all of his web sites now since "free" can't exist any more. And here's another thought--not only the USA uses the internet. So how will international sites be dealt with--new tariffs I suppose? Internet data import/export tax? Data packet shipping charges?

Furthermore, don't larger web companies already pay for bandwidth, hosting, etc? And don't ISP subscribers also already pay for these connections and the bandwidth they incur by using the service? (hint: yes--a lot) Some ISPs already offer different levels of service to consumers where they have monthly data transfer caps or lower bandwidth, so the data being pushed/pulled across the network is already being paid for. So why allow for double charging? What the telcos are asking is analogous to me paying for a stamp to mail a letter and then forcing the receiver to ALSO pay for a stamp to put on that letter. Maybe as well as you paying to refill your car's gas tank, the maker of your car should also have to pay by the gallon. After all, car manufacturers are enjoying free benefits by making their cars perform so well--shouldn't oil companies be recompensated for the auto maker's free ride?

Allowing the telcos to offer this kind of mafioso "protection" to web site operators is a great way to cripple the Internet. But the net sure was nice while it lasted. Don't ruin network neutrality by letting the telcos dictate the shape of the internet.

 Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
 Remote host: 192.91.172.36
 Remote IP address: 192.91.172.36

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Michael Palamara [laserm@netaxs.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 8:23 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Michael Palamara (laserm@netaxs.com) writes:

Chief Kevin Martin,
Your comments on tiering the internet is ridiculous. It is one of the reasons why the internet works and to tier it is to destroy it. My votes and political contribution will go toward those that remove this idea from the political sphere. I will actively lobby to making it a crime to tier the internet. You have made a huge mistake by suggesting to tier the internet.

Thank You,
Michael Palamara
Bloomfield, NJ

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 70.111.50.80
Remote IP address: 70.111.50.80

```
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 24.95.66.251
Remote IP address: 24.95.66.251
```

Sandralyn Bailey

From: Michael Vohs [mr_p_bear@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:30 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Michael Vohs (mr_p_bear@yahoo.com) writes:

Dear Chariman Martin,

I whole heartedly disagree with your recent decision to support a tiered Internet by allowing ISPs to limit bandwidth in exchange for increased fees.

I think it is outrageous to give a private corporation the right to adjust or increase fees on an individual basis.

As an analogy, One can easily imagine a situation where the postal service or phone company charged you more because they didn't like or agree with the content of your speech.

This decision amounts to privatizing censorship and needs to be reconsidered.

Sincerely,

Michael Vohs.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 209.198.147.28
Remote IP address: 209.198.147.28

Sandra Lyn Bailey**RECEIVED**

From: Mike Christensen [mike_christensen@yahoo.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 1:52 PM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mike Christensen (mike_christensen@yahoo.com) writes:

I would like to tell you that a tiered Internet is a bad idea. We cannot go through with plans to build anew business entity hosting servcies in the SMB market taking place over the Internet with expensive tiered Internet services. We could also not hope that the investors would want to invest in our model because of the uncertainty surrounding this issue. We would also feel compelled to use legal means to protect our investments already in this area against anyone who would try to extort more than their fair value. I understand AT&T has been granted the right to most of their former monopoly, and now wants to use that power to push this issue. Just remember people got fed up with AT&T before and they will again. No one except the greedy want a tiered Internet which is already being paid for by all customers, we will fight in the courts, public opinion, and politics before we let it happen.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 66.185.4.21
Remote IP address: 66.185.4.21

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Mike Jacobs [bryantftbl20@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:49 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mike Jacobs (bryantftbl20@hotmail.com) writes:

What your essentially doing is destroying the basic fabric of the World Wide Web for your own personal greed. The rich will get richer and the poor will continue to make the streets unsafe. Thank you very much...

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 199.103.143.97
Remote IP address: 199.103.143.97

SandraLyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Mike Kahler [mike_kahler@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 10:46 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mike Kahler (mike_kahler@hotmail.com) writes:

Chairman Martin, Please do not allow telcos and other ISP to charge extrea fees for bandwidth on the internet.

Thank you,
Mike Kahler

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 71.108.143.150
Remote IP address: 71.108.143.150

Sandralyn Bailey

RECEIVED

From: Mike Martinet [mmrtnt@earthlink.net]
Sent: Thursday, February 09, 2006 11:40 AM
To: KJMWEB; Michael Copps; Jonathan Adelstein; Deborah Tate
Subject: Net Neutrality and Incumbent Telcos

APR - 3 2006
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Greetings,

I am fed up with the stagnant, overpriced and overhyped condition of broadband access in the US.

Starting with this one:

http://techdirt.com/articles/20060209/0757206_F.shtml

I am going to begin sending you folks relevant articles from Techdirt concerning broadband and the greedy, corrupt, inefficient companies entrusted with supplying it to the American public under the equally abhorrent mismanagement provided by the FCC.

"Telecom Doublespeak, Network Neutrality And Rewriting The Rules Predictions Contributed by Mike on Thursday, February 9th, 2006 @ 07:58AM from the it-all-comes-together dept.

"As we've hit the 10th year mark on the Telecom Act of 1996 and people are finally realizing it's time for a rewrite, it seems that rather than serious discussions about what needs to be done, we're getting spin and doubletalk from paid shills paid for by telcos who are trying to claim that this is about "choice." That's rather amusing, because the point that others are making is that the whole reason this is a problem is because there is no real choice, in that the telcos have been able to cut out all of the real competition -- even in cases where they got all sorts of government assistance in exchange for promises to keep the competition around. It appears, however, that the paid shills have successfully convinced FCC chief Kevin Martin (apparently the way to his heart is to sing him Happy Birthday). He's now been quoted, once again, as saying that there's no reason to worry about network neutrality because there's no evidence that the telcos are doing anything. Apparently, he hasn't been listening to Verizon, AT&T and BellSouth, who haven't missed an opportunity in the past few months to say very publicly that they're doing everything they can to end network neutrality on their networks."

Regards,

Mike Martinet (Not affiliated with Techdirt)
Las Vegas, NV

Sandralyn Bailey**RECEIVED**

From: Mike Smith [Supermikeii@hotmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 23, 2006 6:04 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mike Smith (Supermikeii@hotmail.com) writes:

Tiered Internet is a very bad idea for consumers. We already pay for the service that is being provided (often poorly) by ISP's. Tiered Internet will only reduce the value for the consumer while limiting choices and innovation in the future. This is a double dip for the telcos and should not be considered.

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 216.160.194.194
Remote IP address: 216.160.194.194

RECEIVED

SandraLyn Bailey

From: Mike Walter [mike@geekhouse.com]
Sent: Friday, March 24, 2006 9:44 AM
To: KJMWEB
Subject: Comments to the Chairman

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Mike Walter (mike@geekhouse.com) writes:

I do not understand why you would allow companies like AT&T to charge sites like Google for bandwidth that it already pays for. Companies like myself only have small amounts of bandwidth that we already pay for. We have customers using AT&T at their internet connection. They use this connection to obtain email, websites, and other hosting services we provide. Now AT&T could come to us and say, hey your customers are getting data from your network over our lines. You need to shell out x dollars to keep sending that data. You see, what doesn't make sense is the customer has already paid AT&T for internet access, now they want to charge me for the sites my customer accesses? That is ridiculous. I hope you can understand the gravity of what you are suggesting allow to happen. Thank you, Mike Walter

Server protocol: HTTP/1.1
Remote host: 69.4.70.201
Remote IP address: 69.4.70.201